

the people from their public servants but also to moderate disappointment and discontent. The sooner the people can hope for remedy the more patiently do they submit to that which they consider error or injustice.

A four years term is long enough for a good president and too long for a bad one.

The Wages of Sin.

Press dispatches announce that Neely, the embezzler of Cuban postal funds, who, by the decision of the Supreme Court, is to be sent back to the island for trial, has broken down and is a complete wreck. If the report is true, it is only another illustration of the fact that the wages of sin is death. Aside from the moral principle involved, nothing pays a larger dividend of suffering on the investment than a breach of trust.

The gnawing of conscience and the fear of detection rob the offender of happiness before he is found out and when his wrong-doing is discovered personal disgrace and the anguish of friends embitter his life. And yet, in spite of the warnings which come from every age and from every country, scarcely a day passes but some trusted employe in private life or in public position is blazoned forth as a defaulter.

Most defalcations grow out of the temporary use of trust funds for personal advantage, when the trustee feels sure that he can return the amount on demand. Every boy should be taught the rule that no one can safely use trust money as a private fund, no matter how certain he may be of his ability to make good the loan.

Trust funds and private money should never be mingled.

Subsidized Instruction.

It is a bad sign when the founder of a university seeks to dominate the mind of the teacher of that university. It is a good sign when the teacher rebels and surrenders his salary in preference to surrendering his principles.

Stanford university has lost six professors, and the upheaval is the result of the attempt of the founder's widow to regulate the convictions of some of the instructors in the institution.

In May, 1900, Professor Ross attended a mass meeting held in San Francisco for the purpose of protesting against the coming of Japanese laborers to this country. He delivered an address on this occasion in which he insisted on the exclusion of the Japanese as a measure of wisdom in the light of our experience with the Chinese. It seems that for many years Senator Stanford, who was president of the Southern Pacific railroad, had the habit of importing coolie labor, and for this he was frequently denounced by those opposed to that labor. This, it is said, explains Mrs. Stanford's sensitiveness on this point.

It may have been that Mrs. Stanford was further prejudiced against Professor Ross because she had been informed that he was an advocate of bimetallism and in favor of restricting the power of corporations. It has never been claimed, however, that Professor Ross ever carried his politics into the classroom. On the contrary, it is said of him that in his lectures to his classes he was eminently fair, invariably presenting both sides of every question with which he had to deal.

Although Professor Ross' notions had greatly

prejudiced him in Mrs. Stanford's eyes, he was a favorite not only with the president of the university, but with all with whom he came in contact. But as soon as the report of his anti-Japanese speech reached Mrs. Stanford she insisted upon his resignation and the resignation was forthcoming. Subsequently, Professor George E. Howard of the same university took occasion to criticize the policy of interfering with the liberty of speech in university discussion. Professor Howard boldly declared that Professor Ross' dismissal was "a blow aimed directly at academic freedom and to the cause of American education." He added:

The blow does not come directly from the founder. It really proceeds from the sinister spirit of social bigotry and commercial intolerance, which is just now the deadliest foe of American democracy. In order that we may attain the highest ideal of social, moral, and intellectual life our university must be the inviolable sanctuary of free inquiry.

Soon after Professor Ross' dismissal, Professor Aldrich resigned, declaring that he could not teach in Stanford university under the circumstances.

As soon as Professor Howard's remarks became known to Mrs. Stanford, she asked for an apology from the professor for his criticism of the university's course towards Ross. Professor Howard defended himself by saying that he had simply made a fair presentation of the influences that resulted in Professor Ross' dismissal. He declined to apologize, and on Monday of last week, he was informed that his resignation would be accepted, but was given the privilege of remaining until the end of the term. He refused to avail himself of this privilege and immediately left the university.

On Tuesday Professor Hudson of the English department and Professor Little of the Chair of Mathematics resigned. On Wednesday Professor Spencer of the History department tendered his resignation—all giving as a reason that they did not care to teach in a university where liberty of speech was curtailed as it was at Stanford.

It is significant that the six instructors who thus left Stanford university were among the most popular and successful teachers in the institution. It is no surprise to be told that this university has lost considerable prestige because of the attempt to control the convictions of teachers. The student has small prospect of acquiring valuable information when the conscience and conviction of his teacher are dominated by one whose power and authority come exclusively from financial connection with the school. If the men and women whose lives are dedicated to the instruction of the young are not to speak what they conceive to be the truth, for fear of offending the university financiers, then little care need be exercised as to the character and ability of university instructors. A college diploma and a post-graduate course in a corporation atmosphere is, then, all that is necessary to fit a man or woman for a college professorship. But if the young people who attend our universities are to make the most of their opportunities, then it is essential that men and women who instruct them shall have the brains to think for themselves and the courage to express their opinions without fear or favor.

The policy that resulted in the six resignations at Stanford university may endear that institution to those who imagine that the champions of class privilege are the only ones who have the right to independent thought, but among men and women

who believe that the successful college must have as its professors men of thought and conviction in order to produce results, Stanford university will not take high rank. And it is no wonder that today all California is blushing for the policy of a university that otherwise might be a credit and advantage to the great state in which it is located.

Shelving General Miles.

The Chicago Tribune, a republican newspaper, is authority for the statement that the army reorganization bill is so constructed that the President may appoint a successor to General Miles, and thus force that famous soldier to apply for retirement. According to the Tribune: "General Miles could not be retired against his will until August 3, 1903. By that time both General Otis and General Brooke will be retired under the law, and thus their chances of becoming lieutenant-generals will disappear. It is believed, therefore, that a movement has been set on foot to compel General Miles to retire. It is said the scheme is to persuade President McKinley to withhold the nomination for lieutenant-general from General Miles unless he will agree to retire. This he can do of his own motion on August 8 of this year, two years before his retirement under operation of the law."

The Tribune continues: "General Miles will be required to agree to apply for retirement in August of this year, otherwise he will not be appointed to the grade of lieutenant-general. As a matter of course, if the President consents to the scheme, General Miles will be helpless and will have to retire. If he refuses both General Brooke and General Otis will be made lieutenant-generals and both will be retired."

Thereupon, suggests The Tribune, "Adjutant General Corbin, who is at present a major general under the law and who remains such under the reorganization bill, will be nominated for lieutenant-general in command of the army. He does not retire until 1906 by operation of the law, although he may retire of his motion in September, 1904. This would give President McKinley the opportunity to create no less than four lieutenant-generals."

This dispatch appeared in the Tribune of January 23. Plausibility is given to the expose by the fact that the Chicago Inter-Ocean, another republican newspaper, in its issue of January 24, has an editorial in which it boldly demands that General Miles be shelved. The Inter-Ocean bases its demand on the ground that during the Spanish-American war General Miles proved "a complete failure," and it strongly insists that the lieutenant-generalcy should go to General Otis, General Brooke or General Shafter. It credits Otis with "bringing order out of the Philippine chaos." It credits Brooke with having "distinguished himself in Cuba." It credits Shafter with "having won the only hard campaign of the Spanish war." In this light it is not difficult to understand why the Inter-Ocean should regard General Miles' record in the Spanish-American war as "a complete failure."

The fact is, however, that but for Miles the Shafter campaign would have been an ignominious one; but for Miles, no protest would have been raised against the policy of feeding embalmed beef to the soldiers; but for Miles the privates in the ranks would not have had, high in authority, a friend who was brave enough to protest against wrong, even when it was evident that the wrong was being perpetrated by administration favorites.

It will not be surprising if the plan as outlined by the Tribune is carried out, but when General Miles is shelved, the republican newspapers will be kept busy explaining it.